UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/912,485	07/26/2001	Tetsuya Ueno	KUD.042	6277

21254 7590 03/09/2006

MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER	
MILLS, DONALD L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2662	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BV

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/912,485	UENO, TETSUYA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Donald L. Mills	2662	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Transitional After Final Practice

1. Since this application is eligible for the transitional procedure of 37 CFR 1.129(a), and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(r) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action is hereby withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(a). Applicant's first submission after final filed on 13 December 2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 14, 15, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ma et al. (US Patent Number: 6,795,867), hereinafter referred to as Ma.

Regarding claims 1 and 20 (equivalently), Ma teaches a Gatekeeper 108 connected to an H.323 network (Figure 1; col. 4; lines 40-46; A gatekeeper connected to an H323 network), comprising: a message receiving section (Figure 5, steps 502, 506 & 518; a first message receiving section) which receives the original setup message from an endpoint 112 (Figure 1; col. 5, lines 63-64; figure 5; col. 9, lines 11-12; which receives a gatekeeper discovery message

from an end point); a transmitting section (Figure 5, steps 504, 508, 516 & 522; col. 9, lines 13-14; a transport data transmitting section); and a Load Management Unit LMU (Figure 1; col. 2, lines 48-49; a control section) which determines which gatekeeper of a plurality of gatekeepers should setup and service the call based upon loading of the gatekeepers (Col. 2, lines 52-53; col. 8, lines 55-56; which determines whether said gatekeeper has the lightest load among a plurality of gatekeepers including said gatekeeper). Based on the its selection (Col. 2. lines 53-54; when it is determined that said gatekeeper has the lightest load), furthermore (As indicated in Figure 1, with two gatekeepers, shifting the load from the most burdened gatekeeper to the lesser-burdened gatekeeper is logically equivalent to the gatekeeper with the lightest load since there are only two gatekeepers. See column 5, lines 53-69,) LMU either directs the assigned gatekeeper to setup and service the call or redirects the endpoint to a servicing gatekeeper (Col. 2, lines 53-56; and controls said transport data transmitting section to transmit transport data to said end point in response to the gatekeeper discovery message).

Regarding claims 2 and 9, Ma discloses *wherein said control section controls said transport data transmitting section not to transmit data in response to the gatekeeper discovery message, when it is determined that said gatekeeper does not have the lightest load* (Referring to Figure 1, redirection of calls from one Gatekeeper to another Gatekeeper (independent first and second gatekeepers) performs the goals of load distribution and load balancing among multiple Gatekeepers via each Gatekeeper's LMU. As indicated in Figure 1, with two gatekeepers, shifting the load from the most burdened gatekeeper to the lesser-burdened gatekeeper is logically equivalent to the gatekeeper with the lightest load since there are only two gatekeepers;

thereby, not transmitting data from the gatekeeper with the greater burden. See column 5, lines 53-69.)

Regarding claim 3, Ma teaches the LMU (Figure 1; said control section), contained in the Gatekeeper 108, determines which Gatekeeper 108 or 109 will service the call (Figure 1; col. 6, lines 10-12) based upon loading of the gatekeepers (Figure 1; col. 8, lines 55-56). To enable this function, it is inherent in Ma that a memory / storage exists in LMU for holding and maintaining the current load information among a plurality of gatekeepers. Ma further teaches if the LMU (Col. 6, line 13; a first control section) determines that the Gatekeeper 108 will service the call (Col. 6, lines 13-15; when it is determined that said gatekeeper has the lightest load), it transfers control for continued call setup to the Gatekeeper 108 for the endpoint which initiates the call (Col. 6, lines 13-15; transmit transport data to said end point in response to said gatekeeper discovery message).

Regarding claim 8, Ma teaches a load distributing method in a communication system, which comprises an IP Network 102 (Figure 1; col. 3, line 55; a network); an endpoint 112 operatively connected to IP Network 102 (Figure 1; col. 3, lines 57-59; an endpoint operatively connected to said network); and a plurality of Gatekeepers 108-109 (Figure 1; col. 3, lines 55-56; a plurality of gatekeepers including first and second gatekeepers), said method comprising:

Receiving a call setup message from endpoint 112 to initiate a call to endpoint 114 (Figure 1, col. 5, lines 63-64; receiving a gatekeeper discovery message from said end point in said first gatekeeper);

Upon receipt of the setup message, the LMU, contained in the Gatekeeper 108, determines which Gatekeeper 108 or 109 will service the call (Figure 1; col. 6, lines 10-12; of

said plurality of gatekeepers, in said first gatekeeper to determine whether said first gatekeeper has the lightest load among said plurality of gatekeepers) based upon loading of the gatekeepers (Figure 1; col. 8, lines 55-56; referring to a load state list which indicates identifiers of ones having lighter loads); and

If the LMU determines that the Gatekeeper 108 will service the call (Col. 6, lines 13-15; when it is determined that said gatekeeper has the lightest load), it transfers control for continued call setup to the Gatekeeper 108 for the endpoint 112 (Col. 6, lines 13-15; transmitting transport data to said end point in response to said gatekeeper discovery message in said first gatekeeper).

Regarding claim 14, Ma discloses *wherein a load distribution is carried out to equalize a load autonomously between gatekeepers in said plurality of gatekeepers* (Referring to Figure 1, redirection of calls from one Gatekeeper to another Gatekeeper performs the goals of load distribution and load balancing among multiple Gatekeepers. See column 5, lines 56-69.)

Regarding claim 15, Ma discloses *wherein said load comprises a ratio of a number of actual registrations to a maximum number of registrations which can be registered by said gatekeeper* (Referring to Figure 1, Gatekeepers **108** and **109** act as the central point for all calls within their respective Gatekeeper zones and provide call control services to registered endpoints, each gatekeeper inherently comprises a ratio of actual to maximum registrations since each gatekeeper comprises a theoretical maximum number of supportable connections. See column 5, lines 19-21.)

Regarding claim 17, Ma discloses *wherein said control section controls said transport data transmitting section to transmit transport data to said end point in response to the gatekeeper discovery message only when it is determined that said gatekeeper has the lightest*

load (Referring to Figure 1, Gatekeepers **108** and **109** act as the central point for all calls within their respective Gatekeeper zones and provide call control services to registered endpoints. See column 5, lines 19-21. Redirection of calls from one Gatekeeper to another Gatekeeper performs the goals of load distribution and load balancing among multiple Gatekeepers, and as indicated in Figure 1, with two gatekeepers, shifting the load from the most burdened gatekeeper to the lesser-burdened gatekeeper is logically equivalent to the gatekeeper with the lightest load since there are only two gatekeepers. See column 5, lines 56-69.)

Regarding claim 18, Ma discloses *wherein said first gatekeeper is independent of said second gatekeeper and shares information with said second gatekeeper* (Referring to Figure 1, redirection of calls from one Gatekeeper to another Gatekeeper (independent first and second gatekeepers) performs the goals of load distribution and load balancing among multiple Gatekeepers (sharing information). See column 5, lines 56-69.)

Regarding claim 19, Ma discloses *wherein said first and second gatekeepers autonomously determine which of said first and second gatekeepers has a lightest load* (Referring to Figure 1, redirection of calls from one Gatekeeper to another Gatekeeper (independent first and second gatekeepers) performs the goals of load distribution and load balancing among multiple Gatekeepers via each Gatekeeper's LMU. As indicated in Figure 1, with two gatekeepers, shifting the load from the most burdened gatekeeper to the lesser-burdened gatekeeper is logically equivalent to the gatekeeper with the lightest load since there are only two gatekeepers. See column 5, lines 53-69.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-7, 10-13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma et al, (US Patent Number: 6,795,867), hereinafter referred to as Ma, in view of Mortsolf et al. (US Patent Number: 6,229,804), hereinafter referred to as Mortsolf.

Regarding claims 4, 10 and 12, Ma teaches LMU (Col. 2, lines 48-56; a control unit with load distribution method), contained in the Gatekeeper 108, determines which Gatekeeper 108 or 109 will service the call based upon loading of the gatekeepers (Figure 1; col. 6, lines 10-12; col. 8, lines 55-56; calculating a load of said first gatekeeper as a first load). Ma further teaches a concept of Gatekeeper Zone (Col. 5, lines 30-41) and the coupling among the Gatekeepers 302, 304 and 306 is required so that the LMUs may communicate with each other of the LMUs to support call redirection operation (Figure 3A; col. 7, lines 43-46).

Ma does not disclose expressly how each gatekeeper's load information is exchanged or shared among gatekeepers in the zone (a load stare notice message receiving section which receives a load state notice message from another gatekeeper of said plurality of gatekeepers as a notice transmitting gatekeeper, said load state notice message including a load of said notice transmitting -gatekeeper, a calculating section which calculates a load of said gatekeeper as a self-load and a second control section which extracts the load of said notice transmitting gatekeeper from said load state notice message, and compares the extracted load and the self-

load, and writes an identifier of said notice transmitting gatekeeper at least into said load state list when the extracted load is lighter than the self-load).

Mortsolf teaches a method involves assigning a gatekeeper priority value, which is analogous to "load state" in the claims, to each of the gatekeepers in the zone (Col. 4, lines 22-23). The gatekeeper priority values or load states are used to indicate the rank of one gatekeeper with respect to all other gatekeepers (Col. 4, lines 23-27). Mortsolf teaches when one of the gatekeepers is initialized or rebooted or otherwise brought on-line into the zone, it broadcasts an "active gatekeeper claim or message" (Col. 4, lines 34-38). Each gatekeeper in the zone receives the active gatekeeper message (receiving a load state notice message including a load of said notice transmitting Gatekeeper) from the first broadcasting gatekeeper (Col. 4, lines 53-55; Figure 3, steps 54-56; a load state notice message receiving section which receives a load state notice message from one of said plurality of gatekeepers as a notice transmitting -gatekeeper). The Gatekeepers each independently (Col. 4, lines 55-58; extracts the load of said notice transmitting gatekeeper from said load state notice message compare the gatekeeper priority value (load state) that they were assigned (Col.4, lines 27-31; a calculating section which calculates a load of said gatekeeper as a self-load) with the gatekeeper priority value load state) contained in the first active gatekeeper message (Col. 4, lines 55-58; compares the extracted load and the self-load). In response to this comparison, the Gatekeepers each broadcast a new active gatekeeper message if their gatekeeper priority value is higher than the gatekeeper priority value in the first active gatekeeper message (Col. 4., lines 58-62; Figure 3, steps 58-60; writes an identifier of said notice transmitting gatekeeper of least into said load state list, when the extracted load is lighter than the self-load).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mortsolf with Ma to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4, 10 and 12. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to do so in order to because Ma and Mortsolf are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor to a method and apparatus for distributing load among a plurality of gatekeepers of the Internet Telephony communication system by redirecting communications from one gatekeeper to another gatekeepers. And, the load information of each gatekeeper is available as disclosed in Ma, it could be shared by or exchanged among gatekeepers via the broadcast of active gatekeeper message as disclosed in Mortsolf without requiring any new efforts in hardware or software development as taught by Ma (See column 2, lines 16-17).

Regarding claim 5, Mortsolf teaches each gatekeeper in the zone receives the active gatekeeper message (receiving a load state notice message) from the first broadcasting gatekeeper (Col. 4, lines 53-55; Figure 3, steps 54-56; receiving a load state notice message including a load of said second gatekeeper as a second load from said second gatekeeper). The Gatekeepers each independently compare the gatekeeper priority value (load state) that they were assigned with the gatekeeper priority value (load state) contained in the first active gatekeeper message (Col. 4, lines 55-58; extracting said second load from said load state notice message; comparing said first load and said second load). In response to this comparison, the Gatekeepers each broadcast a new active gatekeeper message (Col. 4, lines 58-59; a load state request message transmitting section) if their gatekeeper priority value is higher than the gatekeeper priority value in the first active gatekeeper message (Col. 4, lines 5862; transmit a load state request message with an identifier of said gatekeeper and said self-load to other gatekeepers of

said plurality of gatekeepers). On the other hand, those Gatekeepers that have a gatekeeper priority value that is lower than the gatekeeper priority value in the first active gatekeeper message do not broadcast another active gatekeeper message (Col. 4, lines 62-65; Figure 3, step 64; and wherein said other gatekeepers selectively reply by transmitting said load state notice message to said gatekeeper based on a load of said other gatekeepers).

Regarding claim 6, Mortsolf teaches each gatekeeper (Col. 4, lines 53-55; Figure 3, steps 54-56; a load state notice message receiving section) in the zone receives the active gatekeeper message (receiving a load state notice message including a load of said notice transmitting gatekeeper) from the first broadcasting gatekeeper (Col. 4, lines 53-55; Figure 3, steps 54-56; receives a load state notice message from said other gatekeepers as a notice transmitting gatekeeper). The Gatekeepers each independently (Col. 4, lines 55-58; extracts the load of said other said gatekeeper from said load state request message) compare the gatekeeper priority value (load state) that they were assigned (Col.4, lines 27-31) with the gatekeeper priority value load state) contained in the first active gatekeeper message (Col. 4, lines 55-58; compares the extracted load and the self-load). In response to this comparison, the Gatekeepers (a load state notice message transmitting section) each broadcast a new active gatekeeper message (Col. 4, lines 58-62; Figure 3, steps 58-60; transmit a load state notice message with the self-load and said identifier of said gatekeeper to said other gatekeeper) if their gatekeeper priority value is higher than the gatekeeper priority value in the first active gatekeeper message (Col. 4, lines 58-62; Figure 3, steps 58-60; when the extracted load is lighter than the self-load).

Regarding claim 7 and 13, Mortsolf teaches a Gatekeeper is not permitted to respond to gatekeeper requests messages if its unique gatekeeper priority value is lower than a gatekeeper

priority value it received from one of the other Gatekeepers (Col. 8, lines 55-58; Figure 3; steps 56, 58, 60 and 64; discarding said load state request message, when the extracted second load is not lighter than said first load).

Regarding claim 11, Mortsolf teaches when one of the Gatekeepers is initialized or rebooted or otherwise brought on-line into the zone of Gatekeepers, it broadcasts a message, a first active gatekeeper message or alternatively as an active gatekeeper (Col. 4, lines 34-37; transmitting a load state request message with an identifier of said first gatekeeper and said first. load to said second gatekeeper).

Regarding claim 16, Mortsolf further teaches *wherein said second control section controls said load state request message transmitting section to periodically transmit said load state request message* (Referring to Figure 1, the Gatekeepers each independently compare the gatekeeper priority value (load state) that they were assigned with the gatekeeper priority value (load state) contained in the first active gatekeeper message. See column 4, lines 55-58. In response to this comparison, the Gatekeepers each broadcast a new active gatekeeper message, if their gatekeeper priority value is higher than the gatekeeper priority value in the first active gatekeeper message. See column 4, lines 58-62.)

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed June 10, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 102

On page 11 of the remarks, regarding claims 1 and 8, the Applicant argues Ma does not disclose *a control section which determines whether said gatekeeper has the lightest load among*

a plurality of gatekeepers including said gatekeeper, and controls said transport data transmitting section to transmit transport data to said end point in response to the gatekeeper discovery message, when it is determined that said gatekeeper has the lightest load. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Ma teaches a Gatekeeper 108 connected to an H.323 network (Figure 1; col. 4; lines 40-46; A gatekeeper connected to an H323 network), comprising: a message receiving section (Figure 5, steps 502, 506 & 518; a first message receiving section) which receives the original setup message from an endpoint 112 (Figure 1; col. 5, lines 63-64; figure 5; col. 9, lines 11-12; which receives a gatekeeper discovery message from an end point); a transmitting section (Figure 5, steps 504, 508, 516 & 522; col. 9, lines 13-14; a transport data transmitting section); and a Load Management Unit LMU (Figure 1; col. 2, lines 48-49; a control section) which determines which gatekeeper of a plurality of gatekeepers should setup and service the call based upon loading of the gatekeepers (Col. 2, lines 52-53; col. 8, lines 55-56; which determines whether said gatekeeper has the lightest load among a plurality of gatekeepers including said gatekeeper). Based on the its selection (Col. 2. lines 53-54; when it is determined that said gatekeeper has the lightest load), LMU either directs the assigned gatekeeper to setup and service the call or redirects the endpoint to a servicing gatekeeper (Col. 2, lines 53-56; and controls said transport data transmitting section to transmit transport data to said end point in response to the gatekeeper discovery message). Furthermore, as indicated in Figure 1, with two gatekeepers, shifting the load from the most burdened gatekeeper to the lesser-burdened gatekeeper is logically equivalent to the gatekeeper with the lightest load since there are only two gatekeepers. See column 5, lines 53-69.) Ma further describes this limitation as "the redirection of calls from one Gatekeeper to another Gatekeeper performs the function of moving servicing of

a call from a non-functional Gatekeeper to a functional Gatekeeper (See column 5, lines 59-62.) Therefore, Ma discloses *a control section which determines whether said gatekeeper has the lightest load among a plurality of gatekeepers including said gatekeeper, and controls said transport data transmitting section to transmit transport data to said end point in response to the gatekeeper discovery message, when it is determined that said gatekeeper has the lightest load.*

In addition, *determining whether a gatekeeper has the lightest load among a plurality of gatekeepers* is well known in the art, as taught by Kliland et al. (US 6,738,383) hereinafter referred to Kliland. Kliland teaches an arrangement for distributing and dispatching traffic in a network, especially H.323 generated traffic, in which "the lightweight gatekeeper has knowledge of valid real gatekeepers' load and, on this basis, the lightweight gatekeeper distributes the traffic towards the least loaded gatekeeper" (See column 3, lines 9-12.) The notion of selecting the lightest or least loaded gatekeeper is a well-known concept.

On page 14 of the remarks, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

On page 14 of the remarks, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where

there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mortsolf with Ma to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4, 10 and 12. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to do so in order to because Ma and Mortsolf are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor to a method and apparatus for distributing load among a plurality of gatekeepers of the Internet Telephony communication system by redirecting communications from one gatekeeper to another gatekeepers. And, the load information of each gatekeeper is available as disclosed in Ma, it could be shared by or exchanged among gatekeepers via the broadcast of active gatekeeper message as disclosed in Mortsolf without requiring any new efforts in hardware or software development as taught by Ma (See column 2, lines 16-17).

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald L. Mills whose telephone number is 571-272-3094. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 571-272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Donald L Mills

December 21, 2005

HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600